1

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

\*E-FILED 7/23/07\*

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION

YUMIN LIU AND KEVIN T. DAI,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALBERTO GONZALES, et al.,

Defendants.

Case Number C 07-00883 RS

**ORDER** 

On March 1, 2007, the Court entered an order to show cause why plaintiffs should not be granted the relief they requested.<sup>1</sup> Defendants' response asserts the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over this matter and requests dismissal, albeit not in a formal motion to dismiss. Defendants' jurisdictional arguments appear to have been rejected by every court in this district that has considered them, and this Court sees no basis to deviate from the considered analysis in those decisions. See, *Qui v. Chertoff*, 2007 WL 1831130, \*2 n.3 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2007) (collecting cases from not less than ten judges in this district finding jurisdiction exists on facts

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> It appears that only plaintiff Dai's immigration status may be in question.

## Case 5:07-cv-00883-RS Document 10 Filed 07/23/07 Page 2 of 3

materially indistinguishable from the facts here). Accordingly, the Court will not invite defendants to make a motion to dismiss. It appears, however, that the issues raised in the complaint likely are amenable to resolution on summary judgment. The parties are directed, therefore, to file cross-motions for summary judgment as promptly as practicable. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: July 23, 2007 United States Magistrate Judge 

## 

1	THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT NOTICE OF THIS ORDER WAS ELECTRONICALLY PROVIDED TO:
2 3	Edward A. Olsen edward.olsen@usdoj.gov, tiffani.chiu@usdoj.gov Justin X. Wang justin@lawbw.com, joanna@lawbw.com, peggy@lawbw.com
4	Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not
5	registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.
6	Dated: July 23, 2007
7	
8	/s/ BAK
9	Chambers of Magistrate Judge Richard Seeborg
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	